	Case 2:10-cv-02116-GMN-LRL Document 17 Filed 04/19/11	Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3	3	
4		
5	5	
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8		
9		
10	)	NIDI
11 12	)	N-LKL
13	) ORDER	
14		
15		
16		§ 2254 in which petitioner.
17	a state prisoner, is proceeding <i>pro se</i> . On April 18, 2011, petitioner filed a motion for appointment	
18		
19	inmates in pursuing his habeas petition and that "the very thought of any legal reading, research and	
20	writing is as difficult and intimidating as Chinese arithmetic"	
21	There is no constitutional right to appointed counsel for a federal habeas corpus proceeding.	
22	Pennsylvania v. Finley, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987); Bonin v. Vasquez, 999 F.2d 425, 428 (9th Cir.	
23	1993). The decision to appoint counsel is generally discretionary. <i>Chaney v. Lewis</i> , 801 F.2d 1191,	
24	1196 (9th Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 481 U.S. 1023 (1987); Bashor v. Risley, 730 F.2d 1228, 1234 (9th	
25	Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 838 (1984). However, counsel must be appointed if the complexities of	
26	the case are such that denial of counsel would amount to a denial of due process, and where the	

Case 2:10-cv-02116-GMN-LRL Document 17 Filed 04/19/11 Page 2 of 2